Daily Bulletin

November 4, 2003

U.S. Urges Fair, Transparent, Predictable Rules for Trade with China
USTR's Shiner says China needs to make "systemic changes" to meet WTO commitments 1

Snow Says Economic "Flexibility" Essential for Growth
Remarks to U.S.-Japan Business Council Nov. 3....... 3

Number of Foreign Students in U.S. Stays near 2002 Level
IIE report says India is again the leading country of origin 5

United States Mission, Office of Public Affairs, 11 Route de Pregny, 1292 Chambésy

U.S. Urges Fair, Transparent, Predictable Rules for Trade with China

USTR's Shiner says China needs to make "systemic changes" to meet WTO commitments

By Anthony Kujawa
Washington File Staff Writer

Washington -- The United States is actively engaged in high-level discussions with Chinese officials to bring about the "systemic changes" necessary to improve market access in China, protect intellectual property and ensure China fully implements its World Trade Organization (WTO) commitments, says Deputy United States Trade Representative (USTR) Josette Shiner.

Under pressure from Congress to reduce the surging U.S. trade deficit with China, said to stem in part from unfair Chinese trade practices, officials from USTR, the Department of Treasury, and the White House's Council of Economic Advisers testified at a two-day House Ways and Means committee hearing on U.S.-China economic relations October 30-31. They outlined U.S. trade policies toward China and called for increased market openness in China and for U.S. goods and services to be treated in a fair and transparent manner.

"Our markets are certainly open to exports from Chinese companies, and we need to ensure that China operates with fair, transparent and predictable rules when it comes to our companies' access to China's market," Shiner told the committee.

"What our producers, manufacturers and farmers want and what they're entitled to are fair, consistent rules and a level playing field," said Shiner.

Citing "positive steps" to implement tariff reductions, revise laws and establish new transparency procedures since China's WTO accession in December 2001, Shiner nevertheless cautioned that China's record on WTO implementation is "too fraught with inconsistencies, delays and enforcement weaknesses to demonstrate clear progress toward the rule of law."

While China has enacted a series of laws and regulations to protect patents, brands and copyrights, Shiner said, China's "conspicuous failure" to effectively enforce these laws and to enact deterrent penalties has made U.S. companies vulnerable to rampant counterfeiting and piracy.

"We need to engage China but also to confront it," said Representative Sander Levin of Michigan, who complained that the United States has relied on "rhetoric," instead of tools such as section 301 actions, dispute resolution mechanisms within the WTO, or special safeguard provisions in the Permanent Normal Trade Relations (PNTR) legislation for China designed to prevent unfair trade practices.

Levin charged that contrary to its WTO commitments, China uses a system of technical product regulations as non-tariff barriers to trade, and value-added taxes (VAT) to discriminate against U.S. semiconductor imports.

"The American public is growing more impatient because they feel like by the time any of these agreements are truly enforced, our own manufacturers will be long gone," Representative Mark Foley told the officials.

But Representative Philip Crane of Illinois cautioned that the United States should not impose punitive tariffs on China. "We should not resort to protectionism," said Crane. "Such tariffs would invite counter-retaliation and would penalize many U.S. interests, including U.S. consumers."

Discussing factors that have contributed to the estimated 2.5 million decrease in U.S. manufacturing jobs since March 2001, Secretary-Treasurer of the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations (AFL-CIO) Richard Trumka, also testifying before the committee, called the Chinese government's violation of international trade rules, pegging its currency to the dollar and limitation of its citizens' democratic and human rights, "key contributors to an unfair competitive advantage."

"The Chinese government is outing its international obligations, and the U.S. government must act urgently to hold it accountable," Trumka told the committee.

Trumka said U.S. policymakers have a choice to make in trade relations with China. "They can side with the importers and outsourcers, and stand by passively as China takes advantage of its WTO membership and access to the U.S. market, abusing its own workers and artificially undervaluing its currency in order to undercut American workers and domestic manufacturers. Or they can take a stand for American jobs and act now to ensure that China plays fair in the global economy."

But Chairman of the White House Council of Economic Advisers Gregory Mankiw told the lawmakers that declining U.S. exports, not rising imports account for the recent increase in the overall U.S. trade deficit.

Downplaying the significance of the U.S. trade deficit with China, Mankiw said increased U.S. imports from China, partially re ect decreased imports of the same goods from other countries, instead of a net increase in the U.S. trade deficit.

Increasing imports from China of products such as textiles, footware, toys, sporting goods, radios and cameras, said Mankiw, have replaced imports from other countries rather than add to total imports.

Mankiw said that "export-intensive industries" such as computer and electronic equipment, machinery, transportation equipment, fabricated metal products, and semiconductor and electronic components have contributed most significantly to manufacturing job losses in the United States since July 2000. These are industries where imports from China are small, said Mankiw, and he suggested that U.S. job losses are more closely related to declines in domestic investment and weak exports than to import competition.

Despite the need for progress, Shiner said, China's economy is relatively open to imports. Imports as a share of gross domestic product are 22.8 percent in China, 11.2 percent in the United States and 7.6 percent in Japan, she said. The U.S. International Trade Commission's Director of Operations, Robert A. Rogowsky, also testifying before the committee, added that U.S. exports to China in 2002 increased 14 percent to $20 billion. This contrasts with the downward trend for U.S. exports worldwide, he said.

Committee Chairman Bill Thomas of Florida cautioned that China should not be viewed as a “scapegoat for systemic problems” in the United States, such as U.S. tax laws that make firms uncompetitive, or for a company’s failure to integrate into the global economy.

Discussing challenges to successfully monitor and enforce Chinese compliance with WTO commitments relating to protection of intellectual property, lawmakers pressed officials to explain what measures the United States might take to ensure Intellectual Property Rights protections.

Shiner said that initiating a Trade Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) dispute settlement case against China within the WTO would not bring about the kind of “systemic changes” necessary in China. Rather, she said, the U.S. approach is to work with top-level officials such as China’s Vice Premier, Wu Yi, to ensure the enforcement and upgrading of Chinese laws “across the board.”

“There is much more to be done and we’ve made it clear to them that despite the magnitude of the task, we’re going to need to see results across the board in these areas or else we’ll have to move to stronger measures,” said Shiner.

“What we’ve made clear to them [the Chinese government] is we need systemic across-the-board action,” added Shiner. China will be held to a “high standard very quickly,” she said.

Snow Says Economic “Flexibility” Essential for Growth

Remarks to U.S.-Japan Business Council November 3

“Economic flexibility” is central to enhancing economic growth, says U.S. Secretary of the Treasury John Snow.

In remarks to the U.S.-Japan Business Council November 3, Snow defined economic flexibility as “the ability to respond to market incentives and move resources to new, growing, and high productivity sectors.”

According to Snow, “[t]he goals of raising growth can best be accomplished in an international financial system that relies on the principles of free trade, free capital flows, and market-based exchange rates among the major economies.” Following is the text of Snow’s remarks, as released by the Department of the Treasury:

U.S. Treasury Secretary John W. Snow Remarks to the U.S.-Japan Business Council Annual Meeting Washington, DC November 3, 2003

Good afternoon. It’s a pleasure for me to address the U.S.-Japan Business Council this afternoon.

The Administration’s international economic strategy aims to raise economic growth throughout the world. Japan and the United States, as the world’s two largest economies, play a critical role in creating opportunities for the entire world. And you in this room are in the front line of making that happen -- as employers, producers of goods and services, and also as shapers of economic policy in both of our countries.

Your role is even more important because of the changing tenor of our economic relations with Japan and our discussions with the Japanese government. Until just a few years ago, these discussions were focused on market access. They were often contentious. In addition, many in the United States viewed growth in Japan as a threat to the U.S., as if world output were a zero-sum game.

We now recognize that growth abroad adds to opportunities for American workers and producers, and enhances prosperity in the United States. We welcome the contribution that Japanese firms have made to U.S. employment by investing here. And American firms -- your members -- now play a critical role in financial services, automobile production, retailing, pharmaceuticals, and a host of other industries in Japan.

At the same time, the nature of the issues has shifted away from market access, and towards market development, regulation, and corporate governance. These are issues that affect domestic firms as well as foreign firms in Japan. And these issues are often detailed and technical. Current financial services issues, such as the development of defined contribution pensions and regulatory transparency, are industry issues, not foreign firm issues.

I welcome your advice on the key policy issues that we face in the United States. And I am delighted by the role that many of you have played in advising the Japanese Government and the Diet on policy issues.

We also rely on your ideas and analysis in shaping our own view about the Japanese and American economies, and in shaping our discussions with the Japanese government. This is why we have made private sector participation a central part of the U.S.-Japan Economic Partnership for Growth. I strongly encourage you to continue to develop joint policy recommendations for our two governments, as you have done in the Joint Private Sector/Government Commission.

Of course, there will continue to be a role for government-to-government discussions to facilitate a more hospitable environment for trade and investment between the United States and Japan. A recent and important result of these discussions is our agreement in principle with Japan on the text of a new U.S.-Japan Bilateral Income Tax Treaty -- a treaty I was very pleased to announce earlier this year. The proposed treaty reflects the deepening economic ties between the United States and Japan, and the globalization of the two economies. The proposed treaty reduces existing tax barriers to trade and investment between the United States and Japan, most significantly by substantially reducing withholding taxes imposed on cross-border dividends, interest, royalties and other income. This includes the complete elimination of source-country withholding taxes on royalties, certain interest, and certain inter-company dividends. I had an opportunity to discuss the tax treaty with Japan's Finance Minister and Prime Minister Koizumi in Japan last month. Both welcomed the agreement in principle and shared my view of the importance of a new treaty. I look forward to signing this treaty as soon as possible.

This tax treaty is only one small example of our feeling that the U.S.-Japan alliance is as strong as it has ever been. Our alliance forms a keystone of our security relations in East Asia and our economic policy agenda world-wide. Japan has been a vital ally in the war against terrorism. Japan's contribution to the war in Iraq was greatly appreciated in the United States. Its generous contribution of $1.5 billion in grant assistance to the reconstruction of Iraq will help that nation advance as a free people.

Our cooperative efforts with Japan are particularly important for raising economic growth around the world. At the recent IMF/World Bank meetings in Dubai, the United States, Japan, and the other nations of the G7 agreed on a new "G-7 Agenda for Growth." Under this milestone agreement, G-7 countries have committed to concrete supply-side actions to increase productivity, spur growth, and create jobs.

Each country will identify its own policy plan under the Agenda. The United States will work to lower health care costs, reduce frivolous lawsuits and streamline regulations and needless paperwork through President Bush's Six Point Plan. Japan reiterated its commitment to address the obstacles to sustained, vibrant growth -- in the banking sector, in ending deflation, and in carrying out structural reforms and deregulation to raise growth.

The central part of an effective policy to enhance growth is promoting economic flexibility -- the ability to respond to market incentives and move resources to new, growing, and high productivity sectors.

Economic flexibility involves being able to respond to price signals, including signals from international markets. The goals of raising growth can best be accomplished in an international financial system that relies on the principles of free trade, free capital flows, and market-based exchange rates among the major economies. This principle was embraced by the United States, Japan, and the other members of the G-7 in their statement in Dubai in September.

In the United States we had our own period of hardening of the arteries in the 1970's. But significant policy changes, including lowering marginal tax rates and encouraging restructuring and adjustment, led to renewed American growth in the last two decades.

Japan's postwar experience gave birth to the term "miracle economy." However, as the Japanese economy has matured, its growth rate has fallen, and the Japanese economy has struggled through the past decade. I believe that current estimates of Japan's potential growth rate -- 1 to 1 1/2 percent per year -- undervalue Japan's capabilities.

Statistics do show a loss of flexibility in the Japanese economy over time. One striking phenomenon is the decline in the rate of new firm formation in Japan -- new firms created each year fell from about 8 percent of total firms in the mid-1970s to less than 4 percent in the past few years. There is also less exiting of old firms. A much smaller fraction of firms go bankrupt in Japan now than in the 1970s or earlier. But firms that do go bankrupt are much larger and older than before.

This suggests less bubbling up of new activity and new firms in Japan than in more rapidly growing countries, or in the Japan of 30 years ago. And it may also indicate that problems are allowed to linger, without being addressed, until firms eventually collapse at great cost.

The continuing problems in the banking sector are surely part of the reason. Unresolved bank and "distressed borrower" problems freeze productive assets in place. De- ation and very low interest rates also delay the burden of servicing debts, postponing hard decisions for banks and borrowers.

Fortunately, I believe that things are changing in Japan, in a way that will produce more exibility and stronger growth. Prime Minister Koizumi has clearly stated that "no growth is possible without structural reform." The efforts of the Japanese government to deregulate and institute structural reform in areas such as health care, information technologies, and distribution and logistics should open up opportunities for investment and growth.

Banks are making progress in resolving troubled borrowers and removing bad loan claims from their books. A market has developed in distressed assets. And the Japanese government has taken steps to encourage restructuring and revitalization of troubled borrowers. It's important that this process begin at an early enough stage to salvage real value from companies. Banks need incentives to deal with risky loans, including provisioning requirements.

Many Japanese firms are now restructuring for increased productivity and efficiency. The sharp rise in corporate profits this year is in large part due to these efforts, as is the recovery in the stock market. One of the indicators of increased restructuring is the rise in mergers and acquisitions (M&A) activity. Here foreign direct investment can make a particularly valuable contribution, as it has in the U.S. I applaud the Prime Minister's goal of doubling the volume of foreign direct investment, as well as the emphasis that this Council has put on increasing foreign direct investment.

President Bush and Prime Minister Koizumi will continue to pursue policies to achieve stronger growth in both countries, and in the global economy. But for those efforts to succeed, we will need continued guidance and input from the leadership of our two countries' business communities -- such as from the membership of the U.S.-Japan Business Council.

Thank you for your contributions now, and in the future.

Number of Foreign Students in U.S. Stays near 2002 Level

IIE report says India is again the leading country of origin

An annual report on international students in the United States says that despite strong increases in students from countries such as India, Korea and Kenya, the total number of visiting students grew by less than one percent during 2002-2003.

According to its Open Doors 2003 report released November 3, the Institute of International Education (IIE) said India was the leading country of origin for foreign students in the United States for the second consecutive year. The 74,603 Indian students accounted for 13 percent of the total of 586,323 international students. China was second with 64,757 students.

The report highlighted significant decreases in the number of students from Middle Eastern countries. The report said their enrollment in U.S. institutions was down 10 percent to 34,803 from 38,545 in 2002.

Based upon an online survey of U.S. institutions, the report cited new security procedures and financial difficulties as being the primary reasons for the lack of growth in the number of students. However, 54 percent of the institutions surveyed reported either an increase in foreign student enrollments or no change, "reinforcing the view that there is an uneven effect that is being felt strongly by some campuses and some fields and more modestly or not at all by others," said the report.

"These figures re ect the impact of a number of factors -- a weakened economic situation affecting many countries, student and family concerns about safety and possible delays associated with processing student visas, and an increase in competition for foreign students from other host countries. Despite these difficulties, the United

States remains the premier destination for foreign students," said IIE's President and CEO Allan E. Goodman.

The IIE report also said that higher education is the fifth largest service sector export of the United States. The most popular fields of study for international students are business and management, and engineering.

Following is the text of the IIE press release on its Open Doors 2003 report:

International Student Enrollment Growth Slows in 2002/2003, Large Gains From Leading Countries Offset Numerous Decreases

-- India Remains The Top Sending Country- -- IIE Online Survey Suggests Visa Application Process and Sluggish Global Economy Are Affecting Fall 2003 Enrollments --

WASHINGTON D.C., November 3, 2003 -- After five years of steady growth, the number of international students attending colleges and universities in the United States in 2002/03 showed only a slight increase over the prior year, up less than 1%, bringing the 2002-03 total to 586,323, according to Open Doors 2003, the annual report on international education published by the Institute of International Education (IIE) with support from the State Department's Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs.

"The Bureau is pleased to support the annual publication of Open Doors," said Patricia Harrison, Assistant Secretary of State for Educational and Cultural Affairs. "America is a welcoming nation and keeping our doors open to men and women of good will from every part of the globe is vital to mutual understanding and to our own well-being."

Although there were significant decreases in the number of students from some countries in 2002/03, several major sending countries saw strong increases, including India, Korea and Kenya. Numbers from China also increased, but at a reduced rate. For the second consecutive year, India, which increased by 12% to 74,603 students, was the leading country of origin for international students in the United States, followed by China (64,757, up 2%) and Korea (up 5% to 51,519). Mexico, at #7, increased by 2% to 12,801 students, Hong Kong, at #15, increased by 4% to 8,076, and Kenya, at #16, increased by 11% to 7,862. Canada, #6 with 26,513, was unchanged. Of the top 20 sending countries, thirteen countries experienced a decrease in enrollment -- with significant decreases coming from Indonesia (down 10% to 10,432), Thailand (down 14% to 9,982), and Malaysia (down 11% to 6,595). Students from the Middle East were down 10% from the previous year, with decreases of 25% each from Saudi Arabia (4,175) and Kuwait (2,212) and 15% from the United Arab Emirates (1,792). The combined total number of students coming from all countries in the Middle East is just 34,803, down from 38,545 in the prior year.

IIE is also releasing findings from a recent online survey of international education professionals regarding what they are seeing on campus this fall (2003), to complement the more comprehensive Open Doors census for 2002-03. The findings of the online survey would indicate that new security procedures and economic factors do seem to be having some impact on foreign student enrollments, with 46% of respondents reporting some declines in their total international student enrollments. Most respondents (59%) attribute these declines to new visa applications processes, while an additional 21% cite financial difficulties as the primary cause. Others report it as a combination of several factors, including competition from other host countries. In addition, 45% of respondents report a decline in the number of newly admitted international students for Fall 2003 compared to new students in Fall 2002.

Despite these declines, however, it is important to note that 54% of respondents reported either an increase in foreign student enrollments (33%) or no change (21%), reinforcing the view that there is an uneven effect that is being felt strongly by some campuses and some fields and more modestly or not at all by others. A large number of respondents have seen increases in the number of students coming from several major sending countries, including India (32% reporting an increase), Korea (32%), and Kenya (19%), leading some of the approximately 275 educators who responded to this IIE online survey to assert that, in many cases, the perception of possible problems with new visa policies may have a stronger impact on some students than the policies themselves. A large number of respondents reported especially steep declines in new students from Islamic countries, including Saudi Arabia (29%), Pakistan (28%), and the United Arab Emirates (23%). (See HYPERLINK "http://opendoors.iienetwork.org" for complete online survey and Open Doors 2003 data).

According to Allan E. Goodman, President and CEO of the Institute of International Education, "International educational exchange has never been more important for the United States. Foreign students bring intellectual, economic and cultural benefits to our campuses and communities.

“These figures re ect the impact of a number of factors -- a weakened economic situation affecting many countries, student and family concerns about safety and possible delays associated with processing student visas, and an increase in competition for foreign students from other host countries. Despite these difficulties, the United States remains the premier destination for foreign students. At the national, state, and campus level, we need to take concerted action to insure that we retain that position,” Dr. Goodman said.

Open Doors 2003 reports that the 2002/03 increase of less than one percent in international enrollment in U.S. colleges and universities was the smallest increase since 1995/96, and follows five consecutive years of steady growth. Over the past 20 years, since 1982/83, the number of international students has increased by 74%. However, in seven of those years, the number has increased by less than 1%, as various factors, including political events, economic conditions, training needs, and in-country education capacity, have affected student ows from leading places of origin.

Building on dramatic enrollment increases for six years in a row, India again surpassed China as the leading sending country, and now represents 13% of the total number of international students in the United States. China, which sent no students to the United States from the 1950’s until 1979, rose to become the leading sender in 1988/89 and remained at #1 for five years until it was displaced by Japan. Japan then remained the leading sender from 1994/95 until 1998/99, but has fallen to fourth due to surges in enrollments from India, China and the Republic of Korea while numbers from Japan remained virtually at for the past five years, due in part to economic conditions. This year’s 2% decline in students from Japan marked the first drop in the number of students from that country since 1998. The Republic of Korea is now the third-leading sender, with four years of large increases following decreases in the late 1990s re ecting in part Korea’s shifting economic picture.

Dramatic changes in the enrollment levels from individual countries, which in turn have produced peaks and plateaus in overall enrollment totals, have been a feature of U.S. international enrollments since IIE began publishing Open Doors fifty years ago. Of particular note in looking at historic trends is that 20 years ago, in 1982/83, Iran was the leading country of origin, with 26,760 students in the United States (compared to 2,258 in 2002/03), and Nigeria and Venezuela were third and fourth, due in large part to the oil wealth in these nations and their use of that wealth to create scholarship programs supporting international study. None of these three countries are in the top 20 sending countries today.

Open Doors 2003 reports that international students contribute nearly $12 billion dollars to the U.S. economy in money spent on tuition, living expenses, and related costs. Nearly 75% of all international student funding comes from personal and family sources or other sources outside of the United States. Department of Commerce data describe U.S. higher education as the country’s fifth largest service sector export.

Open Doors 2003 reports that the University of Southern California continues to be the leading host institution in the United States, with 6,270 international students, and California is the leading host state. The New York City Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) continues to host more foreign students than any other metropolitan area in the U.S., with 36,086 total, as the home of both NYU (with 5,454) and Columbia University (with 5,148), the nation’s second and third leading host campuses.

In a separate survey of Intensive English Programs, Open Doors reports dramatic decreases in the number of international students who were enrolled in these programs in the 2002 calendar year. The 51,179 students reported by IEPs in 2002 (a mix of university and college-affiliated programs as well as for-profit entities that offer English language training) represent a 35% decrease from the 78,521 students that were here on such programs in 2001, and a 40% decrease over two years. These Intensive English Programs, which often involve different students than those studying in degree programs, have been the hardest hit. This IEP survey was conducted for the fourth year by IIE in conjunction with two leading professional intensive English associations, AAIEP and UCIEP.

Highlights from Open Doors 2003: Note: Additional statistics are available on IIE’s website at HYPERLINK “http://opendoors.iienetwork.org” .

India is the leading place of origin for international students (74,603, up 12%), followed by #2 China (64,757, up 2%), #3 Korea (51,519, up 5%), #4 Japan (45,960, down 2%), #5 Taiwan (28,017, down 3%), #6 Canada (26,513, unchanged), #7 Mexico (12,801, up 2%), #8

Turkey (11,601, down 4%), #9 Indonesia (10,432, down 10%), #10 Thailand (9,982, down 14%), #11 Germany (9,302, down 3%), #12 Brazil (8,388, down 7%), #13 UK (8,326, down 1%), #14 Pakistan (8,123, down 6%), and #15 Hong Kong (8,076, up 4%).

Asian students comprise over half (51%) of all international enrollments, followed by students from Europe (13%), Latin America (12%), Africa (7%), the Middle East (6%), North America and Oceania (5%).

University of Southern California first: For the second consecutive year, the University of Southern California was the leading host institution (6,270). New York University's foreign student enrollment (5,454) was the second largest, followed by Columbia University (5,148), Purdue University Main Campus (5,105), University of Texas at Austin (4,926), and the University of Michigan -- Ann Arbor (4,601). In 2002/03, one hundred and fifty-three U.S. colleges and universities hosted 1,000 or more international students -- three more than last year -- and 29 of these campuses hosted more than 3,000 international students each.

California is the leading host state for international students (up 2% to 80,487), followed by New York (up 3% to 63,773), Texas (up 3% to 45,672), Massachusetts (up less than 1% to 30,039), and Florida (down 4% to 27,270). Sixth-place Illinois had the strongest growth in international student enrollment from 2001/02 to 2002/03 (up 6% to 27,116).

New York City has more international students than any other metropolitan area in the nation, with 36,086 total. The Los Angeles area hosts the second highest number of foreign students (29,486), followed by Boston (24,160), Washington DC (20,678), Chicago (17,319), Philadelphia (11,373), San Jose (11,070), Houston (10,526), Dallas (10,199), and San Francisco (8,393). In particular, the San Jose metropolitan area showed significant growth, up 20% from the previous year and moving from the eighth-leading metropolitan area to seventh place.

The most popular fields of study for international students in the U.S. are business and management (20%) and engineering (17%). After two years of very large growth, the number of international students studying mathematics and computer sciences has decreased by 6%, although these students still make up 12% of the total.

Funds from home: International students contribute nearly $12 billion dollars to the U.S. economy, through their expenditure on tuition and living expenses. Department of Commerce data describe U.S. higher education as the country's fifth largest service sector export, as these students bring money into the national economy and provide revenue to their host states for living expenses, including room/board, books and supplies, transportation, health insurance, support for accompanying family members, and other miscellaneous items. 66% of all international students receive the majority of their funds from family and personal sources, and, when other sources of funding from their home countries, including assistance from their home country governments or universities, are added in, a total of nearly 75% of all international student funding comes from sources outside of the United States.

The Open Doors report is published by the Institute of International Education, the leading not-for-profit educational and cultural exchange organization in the United States. IIE has conducted the annual statistical survey of the international students in the United States since 1949, and with support from the U.S. Department of State's Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs since the early 1970s. The census is based on a survey of over 2,700 accredited U.S. institutions, with a response rate of approximately 90%. Open Doors also reports on international scholars at U.S. universities and international students enrolled in pre-academic Intensive English Programs, as well as U.S. students studying abroad, based on separate surveys. A full press kit and further details on the surveys and their findings can be accessed on HYPERLINK "http://opendoors.iienetwork.org" # # #